

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/849,187	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BREHM, ALEX	
	<b>Examiner</b> Elizabeth A. Shaw	<b>Art Unit</b> 3644	

**All Participants:**

(1) Elizabeth A. Shaw.

(2) Dwight Diehl.

**Date of Interview:** 25 September 2006

**Status of Application:** pending allowance

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 3:30pm

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

None

**Claims discussed:**

1 and 5

**Prior art documents discussed:**

None

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Claims 1 and 5 were discussed to clarify if there was a distinction between the "indicator means" and "indicator element". It was determined that there were the same part and to avoid a 112 rejection, the word "means" was changed to "element" in claim 1.

See Examiner's Amendment. .